REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the current subject matter is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 USC § 130

Claims 1, 4-17 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srimuang (U.S. pre-grant publication number 2003/0061087 in view of Mahapatro U.S. Patent No. 6,571,215. Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glazer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,174,303) in view of Miller (U.S. pre-grant publication number 2003/0036925). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "associating, based on user input, resource information with task items that need to be completed as part of performing a service action by an engine; and first polling a first repository of a first computer system to obtain ~~of~~ resource information associable with the task items, the repository including human resource information, reusable resource information, and non-reusable resource information, wherein: the human resource information includes availability information for human resources, the reusable resource information includes availability information for reusable resources, the non-reusable resource information includes availability information for non-reusable resources; second polling a remote repository of a remote computer system different than the first computer system to obtain non-resource constraint information for the service action, the second polling occurring after the first polling; and scheduling resources needed to perform the service action based on results obtained from the repository of resource information as limited by the non-resource constraint information obtained from the remote computer system, wherein the second polling automatically checks whether a proposed schedule

determined by the first polling complies with the non-resource constraint information in the remote repository."

Claim 29 has been amended to recite: "receiving a request to schedule a service request, the service request comprising a plurality of tasks; polling a first repository to associate each task with at least one of a person, a non-reusable resource, and a reusable resource; first determining a time slot within a time range in which the associated persons, non-reusable resources, and reusable resources are available; polling a second repository remote from the first repository to automatically check whether there are any non-resource constraints limiting when the service order can be scheduled, the non-resource constraints identifying whether a service provider at which the service request was directed is contractually obligated to perform the service request during the time slot; second determining whether the non-resource constraints permit the service order to be scheduled during the time slot; and scheduling the service order during the time slot if is determined that the non-resource constraints permit the service order to be scheduled during the time slot."

Claims 1 and 29 find support, inter alia, in paragraph 50 of the published specification which recites: [0050] The ability to check non-resource constraints when scheduling service also may be useful. For example, the service provider may be contractually obligated to perform particular service on a particular schedule. The resource planner who schedules the assignment of resources may benefit from the ability to view non-resource constraint information, be provided with the results from an **automatic check** of a proposed schedule against non-resource constraint information, or otherwise take into account non-resource constraints when scheduling a particular service order.)

The previous office action noted that Srimuang fails to disclose retrieving information from a remote computer and cited Mahapatro as providing support for such a feature. However, it is respectfully submitted that Mahapatro fails to disclose "polling a remote

-8-

computer system" as previously recited and that Mahapatro also fails to disclose the claims as amended. Table 1 and the associated text describing Table 1 in Mahapatro relates to dates for tasks such as date on which tasks can be completed and the like. Such task deadlines and dependencies are part of information that identifies the tasks. In contrast, with the current subject matter, a service request is first associated with human resource information, reusable resource information, and non-reusable resource information by polling a first repository, a time slot is determined, and then it is automatically checked (by polling a second repository) whether there are any non-resource constraints which prevent scheduling the service request during that time slot (as recited in claims 1 and 29). Furthermore, with claim 29, the non-resource constraints identify whether a service provider at which the service request was directed is contractually obligated to perform the service request during the time slot. None of the cited references disclose or suggest such an arrangement.

Therefore, because none of the cited references suggest determining a time slot in which to schedule a service order during a proposed time slot and later automatically checking with a remote computer system to see if there are non-resource constraints, such as a contractual obligation, which prevent the service order from being scheduled during the time slot as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, claims 1, 29, and their respective dependent claims should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-374.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 31, 2008

/ck3/
Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Address all written correspondence to
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Customer No. 64280
Phone: 858.314.1500
Fax: 858.314.1501

-10-